



ITM

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	PATENT
)	
Abdulsalam AL-MAYAH et al.)	GROUP: 1797
)	
Serial No.: 10/566,389)	EXAMINER: FORTUNA, A.M.
)	
Filed: May 26, 2006)	CUSTOMER NO.: 25269
)	
SOLVENT REMOVAL PROCESS)	CONFIRMATION NO. 3744

* * * * *

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

February 12, 2010

Sir:

The applicants have received the Office Action of October 8, 2009 and have reviewed the examiner's prior art rejections. They again assert that these rejections are incorrect and should be withdrawn. Their further comments are as follows:

The examiner has rejected claims 42-55, 57 and 58 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 97/18166 in view of Lefebvre, Mickols and Herron et al. Although the examiner acknowledges that WO 97/18166, Lefebvre and Mickols do not disclose a second solution containing an additive selected from anti-scaling agents or anti-fouling agents (page 5 of Office Action), he asserts that Herron et al. teach the use of anti-scaling or anti-scaling agents to remove residues from the side of membranes where the osmotic agent is provided. The examiner